

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 1, 2009, the Office noted that claims 25-47 were pending and rejected claims 25-47. Claim 46 has been amended, no claims have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 25-47 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 46 stands objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office asserts that the claim has antecedent basis issues. The Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the objections of the Office.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Moriconi, U.S. Patent No. 5,262,759. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Moriconi discusses a portable computer accepting removable modular display panels of different types.

On page 4 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Moriconi, col. 2, lines 14-24 discloses "the **generating unit**

generates second operation information that is the operation information of the second device executable by the second device, **based on** the second identification information, the second acquired information, and the first acquired information stored in the storage unit," as in claim 25. (Emphasis added)

Thus, the present invention claims that information obtained from one device is used in another device.

However, Moriconi does not disclose that information obtained from one display is used for driving another display. In addition, a display driver for one driver cannot be used for another display. At the time of the invention there was no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art reading Mariconi to think the instant feature was obvious.

In particular, Moriconi, col. 2, lines 14-24 states

Also in a preferred embodiment, modular displays for use with a computer configured to accept them have a **code stored in a memory device**, such as an EEPROM, for identifying the type of display, which is accessed by the computer memory and **matched with a compatible display driver routine for operating the display**, which the computer then uses. Newly developed displays may then be used with computers previously manufactured and sold, **by updating the computer BIOS and providing suitable drive routines** for such newly developed displays. [Emphasis added]

Thus, Moriconi does not generate as second information for a second display based first acquired information stored in the storage unit. It merely chooses the correct driver and generates the data for that **one** associated display.

Claim 26 likewise discloses similar features.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 25 and 26 are not obvious over Moriconi.

Claims 27-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Moriconi, in view of Kohli, U.S. Patent No. 6,041,280. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

On page 7 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Moriconi, Fig.2 2; 3a-3c; 4; and 5; and col. 1, line 56 through col. 2, line 12; and col. 2, line 30 through col. 5, lines 66 disclose "a connecting unit configured to connect the portable information processor to either one of the mobile device and the indoor device," as in claim 27.

However, if the notebook 11 of Moriconi is the portable information processor of the claims, then the Applicant cannot identify either one of the mobile device and the indoor device. It respectfully submitted that neither the mobile device nor the indoor devices are disclosed in Moriconi.

Further, Kohli while identifying the GPS car system, does not identify any other device as in the claims. Therefore, the two references read together do not meet the features of the claims.

Respectfully, the Applicants rebut the assertion that it would have been obvious to combine the features of the two references. The combined features of the claims would not function as the Office asserts as there are missing components as

discussed above.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Moriconi and Kohli, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 27, 35, 36, 38, 42-44 and 47 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 25-47 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./

James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/dp